REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 25 are pending and examined in this application. Claims 10-24 and 26-28 may, however, be found to depend from an allowable claim and would then be allowable with their parent claim or claims.

Claims 5 and 25 have been objected to on the basis of informalities, which have now been corrected. The correction in claim 5, changing "connector" to --base--, has required a similar change in claim 6. In claim 25, "receptacle" has been changed to --reservoir--, as in claim 1.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 2 and further that the base is directly and rigidly coupled to the reservoir and to the needle. Neither Lynn (US 5,167,656) nor Danby et al. (US 4,725,269) disclose the combination of reservoir, valve and needle directly and rigidly coupled together as described in the specification herein.

With respect to claim 4, applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's explanation of Danby. Danby does disclose "rearwardly extending projections 216" that guide a tube within the valve assembly of Danby. These projections 216, however, clearly do not extend "from said fluid egress port to said needle." In fact, two short pairs of projections are provided on either side of a "horizontal" ridge 220, which is an operative element of the valve. As illustrated in Fig. 14, the tubing 124 passes vertically through the described apparatus. The ridge 220, therefore, is at right angles to the tube 124 and interrupts the projections. If the projections 214 of Danby extended from the fluid egress port to the needle, the projections would interfere with the interaction of the ridge 220 and the co-operating "horizontal" v-shaped notch 222. The apparatus of Danby would not work because the operative elements of the valve, the ridge 220 and the notch 222, could not close on the tube.

With respect to claim 5, Danby does not disclose an arm pivotally connected to a base and extending across a beam that has a tube extending along the beam. As pointed out above, both the ridge 220 and the notch 222 of Danby are "horizontal", that is, the components are parallel to each other and perpendicular to the tube. In the claimed apparatus, the bar extends along the tube, and the arm extends across the bar, not parallel to

the bar. In Figures 2 and 6 of Danby the stationary pressure plate surface 28 and the movable pressure plate surface 60 are operable only after the housing is successfully closed. (See column 4, lines 44-52.) The stationary pressure plate surface 28 is fixed to its base, the front section 2. To make the rear section 4 movable with respect to the stationary plate surface 28 (or vice versa), as suggested by the examiner, would make the apparatus inoperative, because the movable pressure plate surface 60 would not apply a closing force on the tube against the stationary plate surface 28. This is apparent because fluid flows through the tube 124 when the front section 2 and the rear section 4 are fully closed. The difference between the two apparatuses is further clarified by the addition of the language "by movement of said arm" in claim 5.

Claims 6 and 7 should be allowed with their parent claims. Although applicants do not feature 28 discloses a "ridge", element 220 in Fig. 15 is characterized as a ridge, and it is believed that the examiner intended to refer to 220 or edge 229, rather than "plate" 28.

Claims 9 and 25 should also be allowed with their parent claims.

It is believed that the claims are now in condition for allowance and the examiner's re-consideration of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

January / 5 / 2010

John R. Merkling
(Reg. No.: 31716)